



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2005

No. 13

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer.

Let us pray.

O God, who hears and answers prayer, bend down and listen to our thanksgiving and praise. We can rest because of Your goodness. You keep our eyes from tears and our feet from stumbling. Give our Senators strength sufficient for today's work. Be in their heads and in their understanding. Be in their eyes and in their looking. Be in their mouths and in their speaking. Be in their hearts and in their thinking.

Help them to remember that trials and challenges strengthen their faith until it is more precious than gold. Lead each of us to Your truth, and may our lives show that You have chosen us for Your glory.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for 1 hour, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the second 30 minutes under the con-

trol of the majority leader or his designee.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning we will have a 60-minute period of morning business prior to resuming S. 5, the Class Action Fairness bill. I will have a brief statement shortly and the Democratic leader will have a brief statement. Then we will follow those statements with a 60-minute period for morning business.

When we resume the bill, Senator PRYOR will offer an amendment relating to State attorneys general. In addition, we have Senator DURBIN's amendment on mass actions pending from yesterday. Today we will begin disposing of these amendments as well as others that may be offered.

Yesterday we had a full day of debate as we did on Monday afternoon, but in order to finish the bill this week we need to begin the voting process, voting on these proposed amendments throughout the day. I am not encouraging amendments, but I do hope that if Members intend to offer amendments to the underlying legislation, they will make themselves available today so we can make the necessary progress.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in advance as we work through this very important bipartisan bill, and I look forward to a very productive session today.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on the afternoon of February 1, 1960, in Greensboro, NC, four college freshmen from North Carolina A&T University

changed the course of history. In an act of remarkable bravery, the four teens strode into the downtown Woolworth and sat at the "whites only" lunch counter. They ordered coffee, soda, and donuts, and as they expected, the store refused to serve them.

The young men waited in their seats until closing time. They didn't know at the time whether they would be beaten, whether they would be dragged out, whether they would be arrested. But they did know right from wrong and that segregation was an intolerable injustice.

The next day the four returned with two classmates. Again, the same order. They attempted to place an order for lunch. Again, the store refused.

Each day more and more students joined the Greensboro Four, including white students from nearby colleges. By the end of the week nearly all of those more than 60, 65 seats at the lunch counter were filled. Eventually hundreds of sympathizers filled Greensboro's downtown streets.

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. was already leading protests in other parts of the South against segregation in schools and on buses, but challenging the segregationist practices of privately owned business was something that was brand new. These four young men had opened a new front on the battle for civil rights.

In the next weeks and months the sit-ins spread to department stores, to clothing shops, to restaurants. In my own hometown of Nashville, and Raleigh and Charlotte and Atlanta and dozens of other cities throughout the South, thousands and thousands of students and civil rights advocates staged sit-ins at businesses that had discriminated. Many of the participants suffered arrest and heckling and violence, but these brave citizens were determined to end the scourge of segregation.

By April of that year, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1149

or SNCC, was formed. The legendary organization led sit-ins around the country. Then, on July 25, 1960, Woolworth desegregated its lunch counters. By August of 1961, over 70,000 Americans had taken part in the sit-ins. Three thousand were arrested in the act.

Finally, in 1964, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act which outlawed forever segregation in public accommodations. A section of the Woolworth lunch counter can be seen not too far from here, at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC. The counter and four stools and a sign advertising 29-cent banana splits sits in a place of honor on the first floor of the National Museum of American History.

As we celebrate African-American history this month, we reflect on these events and so many other events, large and small, that have shaped our country. From slavery to segregation, we remember that America did not always live up to its ideals. In fact, we often fell far short of them. But we also learned that fundamental to our national character is the drive to live out the true meaning of our creed.

In the 108th Congress we passed the African American Museum of History and Culture Act to establish a national repository for this great history. The new museum will house priceless artifacts, documents, and recordings. It will bring to life the vibrant cultural contributions African Americans have made to every facet of American life. Visitors from around the world will learn about 400 years of struggle and of progress. They will learn that the Capital itself owes its completion to America's first black man of science, Benjamin Bannaker, who reconstructed the city's layout from memory after Pierre L'Enfant quit the project.

The new museum's council, which includes many of America's most prominent men and women in business, entertainment, and academia, will meet early this year to begin the hard work of selecting a site for the museum, hiring a director, building a collection, and raising funds. From blood banking to the modern subway, from jazz to social justice, the contributions of African Americans have shaped and molded and influenced our national culture and our national character.

The African-American experience is one of the most important threads in the American tapestry. The National Museum of African American History and Culture promises to become one of our Nation's most prominent cultural landmarks.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in rela-

tion to the statement I will give which pertains to the class action bill be charged to the class action bill. There is no time agreement, but rather than take up my leader time or morning business, that the time be charged against the time on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2005

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the past 2 days the Senate has been debating the so-called Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. I want to spend a few minutes today talking about this bill.

Despite its title, the bill is not about fairness at all, in my opinion. It is about depriving consumers of access to the courts and letting corporate wrongdoers off the hook.

People ask, what are these cases all about? These cases are about things dealing with fairness. Class actions fall in a number of different categories: environmental pollution, insurance practices, wage-and-hour employment disputes, consumer fraud, dangerous drugs, products that kill, and consumer protection. In those categories we have had, in recent years, some very successful pieces of litigation that have made our society a better place. However if this bill had been law, those cases would have been removed to federal court where they would have likely been dismissed. It is important for states to continue to have the opportunity to protect their own citizens in their own courts.

For example, there was a case in New Hampshire dealing with environmental pollution brought by the State of New Hampshire against 22 oil and chemical companies responsible for polluting the State's waterways with methyl tertiary butyl ether. We refer to that as MTBE. These companies were accused of violating state consumer protection and state environmental laws. They were negligent. They produced a defective product and created a public nuisance. In this case, New Hampshire is seeking compensation for the cost of the cleanup as well as penalties, both monetary and punitive in nature. Under this bill, because the named defendant is a citizen of another state, the State of New Hampshire would have to have their case heard in federal court instead of their own state court.

In Louisiana there was a pesticide there that had decimated the crawfish population. At one time, they were bringing in about 41 million pounds of crawfish. After this chemical was put into the waterways, that dropped to about 16 million pounds. Crawfish farmers were going broke. The plaintiffs were all from Louisiana and the harm occurred there. They filed a class action in state court, and a Louisiana state court judge recently granted final approval on a settlement agreement. This case is a clear example of a state

court having the opportunity to interpret its own state law, yet if S. 5 were already enacted, it would have had to be removed to federal court.

There was a chemical plant leak that occurred in Richmond, California that caused a dangerous cloud to form over the town. Over 24,000 people sought medical treatment in the days immediately following the leak. The residents sued as a class, and the chemical company had to settle. While only California residents were harmed in California, under S. 5 this case would have been removed to federal court because the defendant is based in New Jersey.

Insurance practices: In one case, a Missouri state judge gave preliminary approval to a settlement agreement in a class action brought by Missouri plaintiffs, where a pharmacist diluted prescriptions for thousands of patients, including chemotherapy patients. Because the defendant is based in Iowa, although they sell policies in Missouri, the case could be removable to federal court under this bill.

Equitable Life Insurance was accused of misleading and cheating customers. This was a situation of the so-called vanishing premium cases in the 1980s. They sold policies when interest rates were high. They told customers as soon as the interest rates went down their premiums would be lower. That was not true. Class action lawsuits were filed in Pennsylvania and Arizona state courts, and Equitable settled the suits for \$20 million helping over 130,000 people. However, because the insurance company was based in another state, under this legislation, the case would have been removed to federal court and these people harmed between 1984-1996 would still be waiting for justice.

Wage-and-hour employment disputes: In California, Wal-Mart employees have been denied pay for actual time worked. A California state judge certified a class action brought by California plaintiffs. The harm occurred in California, nonetheless, under the proposed legislation the case would be removed to federal court.

Consumer fraud: Roto-Rooter overcharged approximately two million customers \$10 each by adding charges to invoices violating state consumer protection laws. A class action was brought in Ohio where many of the class members live and where Roto-Rooter is based. Under S. 5, the case could be removed to federal court.

AOL, a Virginia based company, charged the credit card of their customers for services even after those customers had canceled their AOL subscriptions. The lead plaintiff in a class action case was a California citizen. AOL wanted to litigate the case in federal court under Virginia law. The California Court of Appeals held that the proper venue was in state court because Virginia law did not allow consumer class actions and the available remedies were more limited than under California law. This would undermine